

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-8 and 10-20 were pending in the application; the status of the claims is as follows:

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,466,330 B1 to Mori ("Mori").

Claims 10-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mori.

Claims 12 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,005,677 to Suzuki ("Suzuki").

Claims 3, 5, 17, 18, and 20 are cancelled.

Claims 1, 6, and 14-16 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Claims 4, 5, and 19 have been amended so that they do not depend from a claim being cancelled by this amendment. Accordingly, the changes to claims 5 and 19 are not necessitated by the prior art and are unrelated to the patentability of the invention over the prior art. These changes do not introduce any new matter.

**35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejections**

The Office Action, states that claims 1-10 and 10-20 are rejected as being anticipated by Mori. However, claim 9 had been previously cancelled. Accordingly, only claims 1-8 and 10-20 were pending.

The rejection of claims 1-8 and 10-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mori, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 3, 5, 17, 18, and 20 have been cancelled. Accordingly, the rejections of claims 3, 5, 17, 18, and 20 are moot.

It is common for fax machines and the like to provide a 'speed dial' feature for quickly dialing frequently dialed telephone numbers. A network fax machine may have an analogous feature for programming frequently used network addresses. While such features enable a user to send a fax with the press of a few buttons, keeping the telephone numbers and network address up to date can be a time consuming task. This is especially true for fax machines that have many addresses, *e.g.* multiple telephone numbers and/or network addresses. The present invention addresses this problem by providing fax machines that automatically exchange addressing information, including multiple addresses, when sending or receiving faxes. The multiple addresses received from the other fax machine may then be stored or used to update already stored 'speed dial' numbers.

For example amended claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "a receiving unit for receiving a plurality of address data from a data communication apparatus at the transmission destination; and a recording unit for recording the address data received by the receiving unit." Thus, claim 1 requires a data communication apparatus adapted to receive a plurality of addresses, *e.g.* e-mail and telephone number, from another data communication apparatus and to record, *i.e.* store, the received plurality of addresses. It is respectfully submitted that these features are not disclosed by Mori.

In each of the scenarios disclosed by Mori, an originating fax machine transmits a fax image to a receiving fax machine as either a Group 3 transmission over a telephone line or as an image embedded in an e-mail. As argued in prior responses, such transmissions do not satisfy the limitation of the sender transmitting a plurality of its own addresses because, a Group 3 transmission does not include the originator's e-mail address and an e-mail transmission does not include the originator's telephone number. However, assuming *arguendo* that the originator does transmit a plurality of its own addresses, Mori

fails to disclose that the receiving fax machine also sends a plurality of its own addresses back to the originator. At best, a receiving fax machine sends a relay report or reception report to the originator, but this does not satisfy the claim limitation of “a receiving unit for receiving a plurality of address data from a data communication apparatus at the transmission destination; and a recording unit for recording the address data received by the receiving unit.” Accordingly, claim 1 distinguishes over Mori.

Claims 2 and 4 depend from claim 1 and therefore distinguish Mori for at least the same reasons as provided regarding claim 1.

Claim 6, as amended, recites “a receiving unit for receiving a plurality of address data from another data communication apparatus” and “a recording unit for recording the address data received by the receiving unit.” As described above in respect of claim 1, Mori fails to disclose such features. Accordingly, claim 6 distinguishes over Mori.

Claims 7 and 8 depend from claim 6 and therefore distinguish Mori for at least the same reasons as provided regarding claim 6.

Claims 10-13 depend from claim 1 and therefore distinguish Mori for at least the same reasons as provided regarding claim 1.

Claim 14 is a method claim corresponding to apparatus claim 1. As provided above in respect of claim 1, Mori fails to disclose “receiving from the specified transmission destination address data corresponding to the address of at least two communication lines to which the specified transmission destination is connected; and storing the received address data in a memory,” as required by claim 14. Accordingly, claim 14 distinguishes over Mori.

Claim 15 depends from claim 14 and therefore distinguishes Mori for at least the same reasons as provided regarding claim 14.

Claim 16 recites *inter alia* a communication controller “adapted ... to receive from the other data communication device a plurality of addresses at which the other data communication device can be reached” and “a second memory for storing the received addresses.” As provided above in respect of claim 1, Mori fails to disclose that a receiving fax machine sends its plurality of addresses to the originating fax machine. Accordingly, claim 16 distinguishes over Mori.

Claim 19 depends from claim 16 and therefore distinguishes Mori for at least the same reasons as provided regarding claim 16.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 10-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mori, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection**

The rejection of claims 12 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Mori in view of Suzuki, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

As provided above, Mori fails to disclose an originating communication device that sends a plurality of its own address to and receives a plurality of addresses from a receiving communication device. It is respectfully submitted that Suzuki also fails to teach such a communication device. Accordingly, the combination of Mori and Suzuki cannot teach or suggest “a receiving unit for receiving a plurality of address data from a data communication apparatus at the transmission destination,” as required by claim 12, or a communication controller “adapted ... to receive from the other data communication device a plurality of addresses at which the other data communication device can be reached,” as required by claim 19. Therefore, claims 12 and 19 distinguish over the combination of Mori and Suzuki.

Application No. 09/631,414  
Amendment dated October 15, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of April 15, 2004 and Advisory Action of September 29, 2004

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 12 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori in view of Suzuki, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

### **CONCLUSION**

Wherefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance, and an early reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

This Amendment does not increase the number of independent claims, does not increase the total number of claims, and does not present any multiple dependency claims. Accordingly, no fee based on the number or type of claims is currently due. However, if a fee, other than the issue fee, is due, please charge this fee to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260.


If an extension of time is required to enable this document to be timely filed and there is no separate Petition for Extension of Time filed herewith, this document is to be construed as also constituting a Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) for a period of time sufficient to enable this document to be timely filed.

Any other fee required for such Petition for Extension of Time and any other fee required by this document pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17, other than the issue fee,

Application No. 09/631,414  
Amendment dated October 15, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of April 15, 2004 and Advisory Action of September 29, 2004

and not submitted herewith should be charged to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's  
Deposit Account No. 18-1260. Any refund should be credited to the same account.

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
Michael J. DeHaemer  
Registration No. 39,164  
Attorney for Applicants

MJD/lfb:bar  
SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP  
717 N. Harwood, Suite 3400  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
Direct: (214) 981-3335  
Main: (214) 981-3300  
Facsimile: (214) 981-3400  
October 15, 2004

DA1-311022v.3